



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/634,122	04/19/1996	MOTOKI KATO	SONY-C4021	8800

7590

04/21/2003

WILLIAM S. FROMMER, ESQ.  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
745 FIFTH AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

RAO, ANAND SHASHIKANT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

46

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

08/634,122

Applicant(s)

KATO, MOTOKI

Examiner

Andy S. Rao

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

*Continued Prosecution Application*

1. The request filed on 12/07/02 as Paper 44 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/634,122 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

2. As per the Applicant's instructions filed in Paper 45, claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-14 have been canceled, and claims 15-22 have been added.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raychaudhuri et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Raychaudhuri") in view of Behlen.

Raychaudhuri discloses a picture encoding method for generating a bit stream being compatible with MPEG 1 moving picture video standard (Raychaudhuri: column 9, lines 5-35) comprising at least a header of a specified layer of the bitstream (Raychaudhuri: column 5, lines 1-40) and extension data added when a header includes more control data than is prescribed for a header according to the MPEG standard (Raychaudhuri: column 4, lines 50-60), the method comprising: storing extension data of an anterior header of said specified layer (Raychaudhuri: column 4, lines 50-60); comparing an extension of a current header of said specified layer to an

Art Unit: 2613

extension of said anterior header (Raychaudhuri: column 14, lines 5-15; column 16, lines 15-20); and transmitting, when said extension of said current header is different from the extension of said anterior header, the extension of said current header and an extension start code indicating the beginning of the extension of said current header (Raychaudhuri: column 4, lines 55-60); and not transmitting, when the extension of said current header is the same as the extension of said anterior header, the extension of said current header and an extension start code indicating the beginning of said extension of said current header (Raychaudhuri: column 14, lines 10-20), as in claim 15. However, Raychaudhuri fails to disclose the use of an extension byte as a part of the extension, as in the claims. Behlen discloses that it is known to use an extension byte as a part of a VLC codeword (Behlen: column 14, lines 25-30) in order to represent control code words (Behlen: column 13, lines 20-40) in DPCM compressed video (Behlen: column 1, lines 20-47). Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of the Behlen's teaching of inserting an extension byte into the disclosed extension headers of Raychaudhuri in order to implement additional control codewords into the Raychaudhuri method. The Raychaudhuri method, now incorporating the Behlen teaching of using extension bytes, has all of the features of claim 15.

Regarding claim 16, the Raychaudhuri method, now incorporating the Behlen teaching of using extension bytes, has the specified layer being a picture layer (Raychaudhuri: column 5, lines 5-10), as in the claim.

Raychaudhuri discloses a picture decoding method for decoding a bit stream being compatible with MPEG 1 moving picture video standard (Raychaudhuri: column 9, lines 5-35) comprising at least a header of a specified layer of the bitstream (Raychaudhuri: column 5, lines

1-40) and extension data added when a header includes more control data than is prescribed for a header according to the MPEG standard (Raychaudhuri: column 4, lines 50-60), the method comprising: storing extension data of an anterior header of said specified layer (Raychaudhuri: column 4, lines 50-60); and decoding said bit stream, wherein data related with a current header data of said specified layer is decoded using the extension of said anterior header when said current header does not include an extension start code indicating the beginning of the extension of said current header (Raychaudhuri: column 14, lines 10-20), as in claim 17. However, Raychaudhuri fails to disclose the use an extension byte as a part of the extension, as in the claims. Behlen discloses that it is known to use an extension byte as a part of a VLC codeword for decoding (Behlen: column 14, lines 25-30) in order to represent decoding control code words (Behlen: column 13, lines 20-40) in DPCM compressed video (Behlen: column 1, lines 20-47). Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of the Behlen's teaching of inserting an extension byte into the disclosed extension headers of Raychaudhuri in order to implement additional control codewords into the Raychaudhuri method. The Raychaudhuri method, now incorporating the Behlen teaching of using extension bytes, has all of the features of claim 17.

Regarding claim 18, the Raychaudhuri method, now incorporating the Behlen teaching of using extension bytes, has the specified layer being a picture layer (Raychaudhuri: column 5, lines 5-10), as in the claim.

Raychaudhuri discloses a picture encoding apparatus for generating a bit stream being compatible with MPEG 1 moving picture video standard (Raychaudhuri: column 9, lines 5-35) comprising at least a header of a specified layer of the bitstream (Raychaudhuri: column 5, lines

1-40) and extension data added when a header includes more control data than is prescribed for a header according to the MPEG standard (Raychaudhuri: column 4, lines 50-60), the apparatus comprising: means for storing extension data of an anterior header of said specified layer (Raychaudhuri: column 4, lines 50-60); means for comparing an extension of a current header of said specified layer to an extension of said anterior header (Raychaudhuri: column 14, lines 5-15; column 16, lines 15-20); and means for transmitting, when said extension of said current header is different from the extension of said anterior header, the extension of said current header and an extension start code indicating the beginning of the extension of said current header (Raychaudhuri: column 4, lines 55-60); and means for not transmitting, when the extension of said current header is the same as the extension of said anterior header, the extension of said current header and an extension start code indicating the beginning of said extension of said current header (Raychaudhuri: column 14, lines 10-20), as in claim 19. However, Raychaudhuri fails to disclose the use of an extension byte as a part of the extension, as in the claims. Behlen discloses that it is known to use an extension byte as a part of a VLC codeword (Behlen: column 14, lines 25-30) in order to represent control code words (Behlen: column 13, lines 20-40) in DPCM compressed video (Behlen: column 1, lines 20-47). Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of the Behlen's teaching of inserting an extension byte into the disclosed extension headers of Raychaudhuri in order to implement additional control codewords into the Raychaudhuri apparatus. The Raychaudhuri apparatus, now incorporating the Behlen teaching of using extension bytes, has all of the features of claim 19.

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claim 20, the Raychaudhuri apparatus, now incorporating the Behlen teaching of using extension bytes, has the specified layer being a picture layer (Raychaudhuri: column 5, lines 5-10), as in the claim.

Raychaudhuri discloses a picture decoding apparatus for decoding a bit stream being compatible with MPEG 1 moving picture video standard (Raychaudhuri: column 9, lines 5-35) comprising at least a header of a specified layer of the bitstream (Raychaudhuri: column 5, lines 1-40) and extension data added when a header includes more control data than is prescribed for a header according to the MPEG standard (Raychaudhuri: column 4, lines 50-60), the apparatus comprising: means for storing extension data of an anterior header of said specified layer (Raychaudhuri: column 4, lines 50-60); and means for decoding said bit stream, wherein data related with a current header data of said specified layer is decoded using the extension of said anterior header when said current header does not include an extension start code indicating the beginning of the extension of said current header (Raychaudhuri: column 14, lines 10-20), as in claim 21. However, Raychaudhuri fails to disclose the use an extension byte as a part of the extension, as in the claims. Behlen discloses that it is known to use an extension byte as a part of a VLC codeword for decoding (Behlen: column 14, lines 25-30) in order to represent decoding control code words (Behlen: column 13, lines 20-40) in DPCM compressed video (Behlen: column 1, lines 20-47). Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of the Behlen's teaching of inserting an extension byte into the disclosed extension headers of Raychaudhuri in order to implement additional control codewords into the Raychaudhuri apparatus. The Raychaudhuri apparatus, now incorporating the Behlen teaching of using extension bytes, has all of the features of claim 21.

Regarding claim 22, the Raychaudhuri apparatus, now incorporating the Behlen teaching of using extension bytes, has the specified layer being a picture layer (Raychaudhuri: column 5, lines 5-10), as in the claim.

*Conclusion*

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy S. Rao whose telephone number is (703)-305-4813. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris S. Kelley can be reached on (703)-305-4856. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-308-6606 for regular communications and (703)-308-6606 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-4700.

Andy S. Rao  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2613

ANDY RAO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER



asr  
April 15, 2003